

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 7-28 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 19, 20, 27 and 28 have been amended as shown on pp. 2 and 5-7 of the Reply. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-4 and 7-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hohl *et al.* ('Hypadapter: An Adaptive Hypertext System for Exploratory Learning and Programming', 1996, pages 131-156). This rejection is improper for at least the following reasons. Hohl *et al.* does not disclose or suggest each and every aspect set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicants' subject claims relate to a quality management and control system that analyzes one or more items appearing in a documentation set in accordance with a plurality of quality metrics that can be tracked according to an automated identification process. A user interface and interactive tool are disclosed for receiving feedback from administrators/users, tracking quality issues across a database in response to the feedback, applying and displaying scores to the items to facilitate quality assessments, and mapping quality assessments across the documentation. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a rules engine that automatically applies the quality metrics to the items to facilitate interactive quality assessments of the items and bulk remediation of a quality problem across disparate items to improve the quality of the documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the one or more items, the bulk remediation includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the one or more items.*

Similarly, independent claim 19 recites *means for automated bulk remediation of the common issues across disparate items in the documentation set to improve the quality of the documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the one or more items, the automated bulk remediation includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the one or more items*. In addition, independent claim 20 recites, *automatically determining strengths and deficiencies, and correcting identified problems in the documentation set based upon the analysis of the items to improve the quality of the documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the items, correcting identified problems includes at least one of modifying or updating content of an item in the document set*. Further, independent claim 27 recites a *quality packet that determines at least one of further quality actions to be performed on the topic and automatically deploys positive features of the quality actions that exceed a predetermined threshold to other topics or automatically applies a corrective action related to the quality actions that are lower than the predetermined threshold to other topics to improve the quality of a documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the item, the corrective action includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the topics*, and independent claim 28 recites *at least one deployment field to indicate further actions derived from topics with scores above and below a predetermined threshold that are automatically applied to the database collection of topics to improve the quality of the database collection of topics wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the technical item, the actions include at least one of modifying or updating content of the topics*. Hohl *et al.* fails to teach or suggest these novel aspects.

Hohl *et al.* relates to an adaptive hypertext system that exploits user modeling for adaptive presentations of information nodes and adaptive navigational support. Specifically, the system generates a detailed model of a user's expertise that is employed to provide personalized or customized assistance. More specifically, individualized presentations of topics and links are tailored to the user's knowledge state and/or preferences. Further, the presentations are dynamically adapted to the user's learning process, which is traced by the system. The

hyperadapter system acts as an adaptive visual information filter that dynamically highlights relevant information customized to the particular user and puts less important aspects in the background to avoid disorientation and/or cognitive overload while browsing. (See page 138.)

Thus, Hohl *et al.* relates to system that provides adaptive techniques to customize content **presentation** to a user. However, Hohl *et al.* fails to teach or suggest bulk remediation of a quality problem across disparate items, which includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the disparate items, to improve the quality of the documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the one or more items.

With respect to independent claim 1, Hohl *et al.* is silent with respect to tracking the one or more quality metrics according to an automated identification process. Hohl *et al.* merely relates to a system that includes an evaluation component that identifies user-relevant topic attributes and/or links by applying selection rules to a topic-oriented model of the user's current knowledge state. Specifically, the selection rules are based on a scoring mechanism that determines the attributes and/or links that most closely match a user's needs and interests. However, independent claim 1, in contrast, recites a rules engine that automatically applies quality metrics to the items to facilitate interactive quality assessments of the items and bulk remediation of a quality problem across disparate items to improve the quality of the documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the one or more items and the bulk remediation includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the one or more items. Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a system that can provide automated and interactive processes that facilitate repeatable document quality scores and enable rapid document remediation. Further, independent claim 1 recites a scoring component that automatically ranks the items based at least in part on the interactive quality assessments of the items, wherein the scoring component ranks the one or more quality metrics associated with the quality of the one or more items to determine a nature of a problem with the one or more items. Hohl *et al.* simply teaches ranking items based on relevance to a particular user but fails to teach or suggest ranking items based on interactive quality assessment wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the one or more items. In addition, Hohl *et al.* teaches that the evaluation component controls

*presentation of topics* by identifying and filtering topic attributes and links based on selection rule sets. However, in contrast with the Examiner's contention, Hohl *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a filter that analyzes the ranks associated with the items and the quality metrics *in view of a predetermined threshold of quality*, extracts attributes from an item with a score that exceeds the predetermined threshold and *automatically applies the attributes to the remaining items*.

With respect to independent claim 19, Hohl *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all aspects of the subject claim. Hohl *et al.* relates to an evaluation component that identifies user relevant topic attributes and links when a topic is presented in a viewer. The evaluation component facilitates presentation of topic attributes and links, such that, the most relevant topics to a particular user are highlighted. However, Hohl *et al.* is silent with respect to means for automated bulk remediation of the common issues across disparate items in the documentation set to improve the quality of the documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the one or more items, and the automated bulk remediation includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the one or more items. Further, Hohl *et al.* does not teach or suggest means for associating a plurality of quality metrics associated with a quality of a documentation set, wherein the plurality of quality metrics tracked according to an automated identification process, means for ranking the plurality of quality metrics and/or means for determining common issues associated with the items based in part on the ranking. Furthermore, Hohl *et al.* fails to disclose means for assessing the common issues and extracting at least one of features or corrective actions in view of a predetermined threshold level of the quality metrics and/or means for automatically implementing the features to the documentation set based at least in part on the common issues that exceed the predetermined threshold level of the quality metrics as disclosed in independent claim 19. Similarly, Hohl *et al.* does not teach or suggest all aspects of independent claim 20. In particular, independent claim 20 recites a method comprising: defining one or more quality controls for items appearing in a documentation set, the one or more quality controls tracked according to an automated identification process and/or automatically determining strengths and deficiencies, and correcting identified problems in the documentation set based upon the analysis of the items to improve the quality of the documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document

discoverability associated with the items and correcting identified problems includes at least one of modifying or updating content of an item in the document set. As discussed *supra*, Hohl *et al.* is silent with respect to these novel aspects.

Referring to independent claim 27, the subject claim relates to a tracking packet including a unique identifier related to a technical documentation topic and a quality packet that determines at least one of further quality actions to be performed on the topic and automatically deploys positive features of the quality actions that exceed a predetermined threshold to other topics or automatically applies a corrective action related to the quality actions that are lower than the predetermined threshold to other topics to improve the quality of a documentation set wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the item, and the corrective action includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the topics. *Hohl et al. merely relates to selecting attributes and links that are relevant to a particular user for presentation but does not teach or suggest application of a corrective action to topics that are lower than the predetermined threshold to improve quality (technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability) of the document.* Similarly, independent claim 28 recites at least one identifier field associated with a technical item topic appearing in a database collection of topics. Hohl *et al.* fails to disclose identifiers that can be employed to track technical item topics. Further, independent claim 28 recites at least one deployment field to indicate further actions derived from topics with scores above and below a predetermined threshold that are automatically applied to the database collection of topics to improve the quality of the database collection of topics wherein quality is a measurable function of technical accuracy, document content scope, and document discoverability associated with the technical item, and the actions include at least one of modifying or updating content of the topics. As discussed above, Hohl *et al.* does not teach this novel aspect.

In view of at least the foregoing, it can be seen that Hohl, *et al.* does not teach each and every feature of the subject invention as recited in independent claims 1, 19, 20, 27 and 28 (and associated dependent claims), and thus fails to anticipate the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP492US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP  
57<sup>TH</sup> Floor, Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731